

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 13 and 19 are independent claims.

The examiner uses Culliss and Kaufman to reject claims 1-22 as having been obvious.

Applicant disagrees. For example, claim 1 recites several features that both references fail to teach or suggest. For example, claim 1 recites "combining the modification made by the editor in a combined search index, the combined modification being included in the combined search index according to the determined reliability of the editor." At least this quoted claim feature is totally absent from the cited references.

The examiner argues that col. 14, lines 35-41 and col. 13, lines 29-34 of Culliss disclose this quoted claim feature. However, the examiner's reliance on these lines and all of Culliss is misplaced. No where in Culliss is at least a determined reliability of the editor disclosed or suggested. That's because Culliss only cares about prior human judgments about which terms or groupings are relevant to which articles (see col. 13, lines 27-29). Further, Culliss uses a two-phase approach, i.e.,

That search engine can then generate a list of matched articles which is then forwarded to the software interface wherein the organization method described herein is utilized to rank the articles. Alternatively, the invention can be simply incorporated into the search engine as a single server-side or client-side software program. (Col. 13, lines 15-21)

In this connection, the invention may initially or continuously utilize the ranking of the articles provide by a search engine. Specifically, the index of the invention may be initially empty or set to a neutral setting and subsequently populated through repeated uses of the invention, whereby the invention "learns" from each user. Each subsequent user would thus benefit from the prior human judgments about which key terms or groupings are relevant to which articles. In this case, the organization or ranking provided by the search engine could initially be used in displaying the articles. Then, after a predetermined event or amount of time occurs, only the index of the invention could be used to organize the articles, if desired. (Col. 13, lines 22-34)

This is very different from combining the modification made by the editor in a combined search index, the combined modification being included in the combined search index according to the determined reliability of the editor, as claimed in claim 1.

Kaufman fails to make up for this deficiency in Culliss. Kaufman merely teaches using the results of a search performed on a high quality, controlled database to assess the relevance of documents retrieved from a search of an uncontrolled public database having documents of highly variable quality. Kaufman teaches parsing the search query and then searching the authoritative database to generate authoritative database results. (see generally, the Abstract) The search query is also used to search the public database, thereby generating public database results. The quality or relevance of the public database results are then quantified on the basis of the authoritative database results, thereby generating a quality index. The results from both the authoritative and the public databases are then ranked on the basis of this quality index.

Kaufman's quality index is not applicant's combined search index because applicant's combined search index is according to the determined reliability of the editor, while Kaufman's quality index is a relevance indicator based, not on modification made by an editor, but a search of some high quality, controlled database.

Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Culliss and Kaufman, with taken separately or in combination.

Claim 13 recites "combining the modification made by the editor in a combined search index, the combined modification being included in the combined search index according to the determined reliability of the editor." Claim 19 recites "combine the editorial modification in a combined search index, the combined modification being includes in the combined search index according to the reliability score of the editor." For at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 1 above, claims 13 and 19 are not rendered obvious by Culliss and Kaufman, with taken separately or in combination.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

Applicant : Michael Witbrock
Serial No. : 09/982,204
Filed : October 18, 2001
Page : 4 of 4


Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-533001 / P255

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 29, 2004


Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906